

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/437,975

Applicant(s)

Zuravleff et al

Examiner

Frank J. Asta

Group Art Unit

2318



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frank J. Asta

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) James A. LaBarre

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 28, 1996Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: claims 1,4,11,13 and 23

Identification of prior art discussed:

Iyer

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. LaBarre was informed that the claims in their present form were not in condition for allowance since the tagging limitation which appears to be the inventive concept and which was extensively discussed in the applicants remarks in amendment A. The examiner suggested that claim 2 be inserted into claim 1, claim 14 be inserted into claim 13 and that "tagging" limitations be inserted into independent claims 11 and 23 to place these claims in condition for allowance. The applicant agreed to make these changes in a supplemental amendment. Further applicant wished to rewrite claims 4 and 16 into independent form. These claims which were deemed allowable in the first office action if rewritten in independent form remained in an objected status. The rewriting of these claims would place these claims and the claims dependnet on these also in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed to cancel claims 2 and 14 since they were incorporated into claims 1 and 13 and the dependencies of claims 9 and 21 were amended to place these claims in

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.